

amending the medical act, making it the duty of the board to prosecute all cases of illegal practice of medicine, the fines collected to constitute a special fund for such prosecutions. A similar clause exists and works satisfactorily in the acts regulating the practice of dentistry and pharmacy.

Reciprocity—Nothing further has been done by the California board in the matter of interstate reciprocity. Our attempts to enter upon reciprocal relations with the District of Columbia were annulled by the passage of the standard-lowering Gallinger bill. You may have recognized in the author of said law the famed opponent of the pure food bill. We believe the equitable solution of the perplexing problem of interstate reciprocity to be the unification of standards through the adoption of the requirements of the Association of American Medical Colleges by the different state legislatures. However, there is apparently no crying demand in this state for reciprocity, and in this regard I would respectfully remind those who decry reciprocity but advocate informal or farcical state examinations, that such a policy would lead to reciprocity and to a reciprocity founded on injustice. During the past five years five California graduates applied for certificates in Eastern and mid-Western states, which furnished California during the same period 160 applicants.

Revocation of Licenses.—The board has devoted a vast amount of time to the enforcement of that part of the law relating to unprofessional conduct and today we report the revocation of the licenses of three notorious advertising abortionists—Josslyn, Meadows, alias Weston, and McGregor Wilson, all of San Francisco. At the next meeting of the board, two more licenses may be revoked for similar reasons. We point with pride to this record unequalled by any other state board. A word now regarding the standard of the requirements. The legal standard in this state is that of the Association of American Medical Colleges for the years of the applicant's matriculation and graduation. We hear it bruited that our standard is constantly being raised. Such a statement is not founded on fact. Our standard has been lowered during the past year, and to our deep chagrin we found the legal preliminary educational requirements lower than those exacted six years ago under the law. This is not the first time that California has taken a retrograde step in educational standards.

During the past year through an oversight in the constitution of the Association of American Medical Colleges certificates from quiz masters were made equivalent to diplomas from high schools. The board has proof of the existence of a mercenary and active traffic in said certificates, whereby numerous thoroughly illiterate students were entitled to matriculate at and graduate from some of the schools of this city. The board was powerless to check this undisguised, nefarious, standard-lowering scheme. But today we bring two documents from the Association of American Medical Colleges, showing a radical change in the legal preliminary educational requirements of this state. (See letters *infra*.) Thus politics and its dire consequences are eliminated from the medical schools of California.

No law is self operative. Individual efforts are the most cogent factor in advancing the cause of medical legislation. My esteemed colleagues will tell you to what extent the position of board member constitutes a pastime, but I desire to state categorically, although not regretfully, that the work, the dreary, enemy-making, practice-losing work, is done by the members residing here in San Francisco. Apart from the consciousness of duty performed, our reward is the privilege, the honor, of appearing before you with a message of truth, urging that the work go onwards and go upwards.

#### ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES.

Columbus, Ohio, March 21, 1906.

Dr. Dudley Tait,  
San Francisco, Cal.

Dear Doctor:

By unanimous consent of thirty-five colleges represented at the association meeting in Pittsburg the amendment to Article III., Section 1 (d), suggested by you was adopted. It now reads: "Certificates from reputable instructors recognized by the State Board of Medical Examiners duly authorized by law, or by the Superintendent of Public Instruction *in states having no Examining Board*, may be accepted in lieu of any part of this examination."

Section II. This examination must be conducted by or under the authority of the Board of Examination or the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the city or state in which the college is located, as provided for in Article III., Section I. (d).

We hope this will give your board absolute authority to govern entrance examinations. There are only a few states that have no examining board. In these we have to make some provisions for the examination of prospective students.

Very truly,

W. J. MEANS,  
Chm. Jud. Coun.

#### ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES.

Chicago, March 28, 1906.

Dr. Dudley Tait,  
San Francisco, Cal.

My dear Doctor:—

Your favor of the 24th inst. received. In consonance with a suggestion made by your board, the association at its meeting in Pittsburg unanimously amended subsection (d) section one, article III, and section two, article III as per the slip contained in the enclosed constitution to which I have set the official seal of the association so that you can file the constitution as a matter of record.

The association feels itself indebted to you for calling attention to this matter and stands ready at all times to be of such assistance to you as is possible. A copy of the reprint of our transactions will be forwarded to the members of your board as soon as published.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED C. ZAPFFE,  
Secretary.